

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
DIVISION OF JUDGES
SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

KITSAP TENANT SUPPORT SERVICES, INC.

And

WASHINGTON FEDERATION OF STATE
EMPLOYEES, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL
EMPLOYEES, COUNCIL 28, AFL-CIO

Cases 19-CA-108144
19-CA-112388
19-CA-125239
19-CA-128656

ERRATA

(ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO CLARIFY DECISION)

On July 28, 2015, I issued my Decision in the above-captioned case (JD(SF)-29-15) (“the decision”). On August 11, 2015, Respondent filed a “Motion to Clarify Decision” (the motion), pointing out that the language on the Notice (“the Notice”) contained in the appendix to the decision did not precisely conform to the Cease and Desist Order (“the Order”) on page 21 of the decision, specifically paragraphs 1(a) and ((b)). The motion also requested a telephonic conference to discuss this motion.

I find the motion to have merit, and accordingly correct the Order on pages 21-22 of my decision as follows:

Paragraph 1 of the Cease and Desist Order on pages 21-22 will now have a new subparagraph (c) which will read as follows:

(c) Failing to bargain with Washington Federation of State Employees, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Council 28, AFL-CIO regarding changes in the wages, hours, or working conditions of our bargaining unit employees, including taking disciplinary action, without first notifying the Union and giving it an opportunity to bargain.

Existing subparagraph (c) will now be subparagraph (d), which will read as follows:

(d) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

Inasmuch I find these changes to be non-substantive errata, I do not find it necessary to afford the General Counsel or Charging Party an opportunity to file a response to Respondent's motion. In light of the above, I deny Respondent's request to have a telephone conference, which I find unnecessary. I will not entertain any further motions for clarification, as I believe my decision speaks for itself. If the parties have any further issues regarding my decision, they should raise those issues with the Board by way of exceptions.

SO ORDERED

Dated: Washington, D.C., August 14, 2015.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ariel L. Sotolongo', written over a horizontal line.

Ariel L. Sotolongo
Administrative Law Judge